DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 277 RC 012 348

TITLE	State of Wisconsin Evaluation Conference Summary: ESEA Title I Migrant Education Programs, Summer of 1979.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison. Div. for Management and Planning Services.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Migrant Education; *Migrant Programs; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *State Programs; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	ESEA Title I Migrant Programs; *Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

The Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Wisconsin Migrant Education Conference was held on August 6, 1979 to evaluate programs and to gather program planning data. Data for this evaluation were collected by means of both structured interaction of the 53 conference participants and questionnaires completed by participants. The teachers felt most objectives had been met; felt the use of performance objectives would have been beneficial; viewed with mixed emotions the math and reading skills lists recently added to the Migrant Student Record Transfer System; agreed that their students had experienced academic growth as a result of program participation; found role playing, seed planting, and story telling especially effective aids; recommended earlier notification of staff employment, more meaningful and useful inservice ideas, more language kits, more bilingual instruction, and better facilities; and felt the two greatest assets to be the excellent food and the field trips. Administrators discussed the need for staff continuity, a recruiter's manual, curriculum similarity, teacher exchange program with Texas, more agency coordination, a public relations campaign, quicker approval of local education agency proposals, a statewide inservice concept, and longer program days and periods. Staff evaluations have been condensed into several tables. (AN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194277

STATE OF WISCONSIN
EVALUATION CONFERENCE SUMMARY
E.S.E.A. TITLE I MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAMS
SUMMER OF 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Eppenbach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Issued by:

Dr. Barbara Thompson, State Superintendent
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Prepared by:

E.S.E.A. Title I Unit, Division For Management, Planning and Federal Services

Archie A. Buchmiller, Assistant Superintendent
Donald Dimick, Director and Deputy Division Administrator, Bureau for Federal Programs and Services
Frank N. Brown, Administrator, E.S.E.A., Title I
Daniel Costilla, Supervisor, E.S.E.A., Title I Migrant Education
David De Soto, Research Analyst, E.S.E.A., Title I Migrant Education
David Krueger, Evaluator, E.S.E.A., Title I

RC 012348

OCT 28 1980

INTRODUCTION

The annual Title I Migrant Education Evaluation Conference took place on August 6, 1979 at the Green Lake Center in Green Lake, Wisconsin. In attendance at this years conference were 53 participants representing the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), the Texas Migrant Council (TMC), and personnel from local migrant projects. In addition, participants at this years conference also included several parents, whose input served to broaden the overall scope of the conference. (See appendix A)

The objectives of the Migrant Education Evaluation Conference included: (1) The evaluation of Title I Migrant Education projects which operated during the summer of 1979, and (2) The use of the evaluation data collected to assist in program planning for future projects. Data for this evaluation was collected by means of both structured interaction of conference participants, and questionaires completed by participants. In order to address a maximum number of topics during this one-day evaluation conference the participants were separated into three groups representing: (1) pre-school and kindergarten teachers, (2) elementary teachers, and (3) secondary teachers, recruiters, project directors, and site coordinators.

In the structured interaction part of the conference each group addressed a set of questions designed to relate to that groups area of expertise and experience. The results of this part of the evaluation are summarized below. (See appendix B & C)

Comments and Ideas of Pre-School, Kindergarten, and Elementary Teachers

(1) The two instructional groups addressed their set of questions by sharing and relating the results of their particular programs. All of the participants felt that their program and most of their individual instructional objectives had been met. Concern was expressed about the need for a predetermined set of objectives for pre-schoolers. It was recommended that at one time or another, time should be provided for teachers from various sites to get together to compare such a list. According to the discussion, "the program objectives are too broad and are not written for specific instructional areas". Most participants agreed that the use of performance objectives would be beneficial to their programs.

(2) The math and reading skills lists (part of the MSRTS) have been received with mixed emotions. Some of the participants felt that it was just another task dealing with the completion of forms. The majority of participants in this group, however, felt that the math and reading skills were beneficial to the program in that they enable teachers to identify skills mastered by the migrant students.

The elementary group was given a special presentation on the use of the skills list, "not as a curriculum guide but as a means of identifying skills that emanate from activities developed by teachers and students". This presentation was conducted by Joan Helbing, kindergarten teacher for the Oconto Migrant Program.

(3) Student achievement was measured by teacher observation. There were no instances of student achievement being measured by standardized tests or any other type of testing. All the teachers agreed that their students had experienced academic growth as a result of participation in the program. Teachers who have been involved in previous summer programs have noticed great improvement in the academic performance of students who attended previous summer programs. This can be judged as a positive outcome which results from student participation in a migrant education program.

(4) Some techniques and activities which teachers found particularly effective were:

Role playing	Language experience stories
Songs dealing with rhyme	Swimming
Planting seeds	Cooking
Story telling	Puppet shows
Simon says	Plays
Language and number games	Jello figures
Phy. Ed. games	Getting Newspaper together
Frisbee	Fruit-loop necklaces
Track meet	Art activities
Field trips	Participation in 4-H activities

(5) Recommendations of the teachers in these groups included:

(A) Earlier notification of employment
(B) More meaningful and useful ideas during inservice
(C) More language kits
(D) More specification with regard to duties and responsibilities
(E) More use of bilingual instruction, particularly at the lower grades
(F) Need for better facilities

(6) Areas considered to be the greatest assets of the program:

(A) Excellent food
(B) Use of field trips to reinforce lessons
(C) Adequate health services
(D) Teacher/pupil ratio (in most cases)
(E) Use of the MSRTS skills lists
(F) Flexibility allowed to teachers
(G) Plentiful supplies and materials

Comments and Ideas of Administrators

(1) Administrators expressed a concern for continuity in the State Migrant Supervisor's position.

(2) Administrators expressed a concern about the growing amount of paper work involved. Site coordinators felt that the paperwork took away from their contact with students.

(3) Administrators wanted a manual for recruiters to be developed by DPI. It was made known by the State Supervisor that Mr. De Soto is presently working on one.

(4) The need for similarity in curriculum to be developed was discussed. Mr. Costilla informed the administrators and site coordinators that he was in communication with the Migrant staff from Texas Ed. Agency regarding this need. The ACUTRACK curriculum appeared to be an instrument that could be used for this purpose.

(5) They expressed an interest in an academic year teacher exchange program with Texas. Mr. Costilla said he would look into this possibility.

(6) It was expressed that there should be more coordination with other Migrant service agencies in order to eliminate the duplication of questions used by the various agencies. The many questionaires were too much of an imposition on the families.

(7) It was suggested that a supplementary sheet to list names for families membering more than five be used in the eligibility forms.

(8) It was suggested that DPI initiate a State Wide public relations campaign.

(9) Administrators and site coordinators requested that DPI approve LEA proposals sooner. The State Supervisor informed the staff that DPI would call for a February 1, 1980 application deadline from CESAs.

(10) A statewide inservice concept was proposed by Mr. Costilla for next summer 1980. It was well received. It was pointed out that DPI should take on more of a responsibility in the area of recruiting out of state teachers and inservice activities.

(11) The idea of an extended day was discussed. Most of the staff rejected the idea. They felt that the day would be much too long for the child. However, Mr. Brown stated that we may pilot extended day programs at some sites next summer if any interest was shown by parents or staff at that particular site.

(12) The idea of an extended program period was discussed. It was noted that most programs are limited to the present number of days in schools because the janitorial staff need time to clean up before schools start in the fall.

In addition to the information collected in the interaction groups, a set of questionaires (one form for administrators and one form for instructional staff) were completed. The analysis of the data from the instructional staff's questionaire is presented below. (See appendix D)

Instructional Staff Evaluation of Migrant Education Programs

All 19 teachers who completed this evaluation felt that educational changes were "consistant enough to be educationally significant". The type of educational changes observed in students were wide-ranging. Table 1 summarizes those listed.

Table 1

Educational Changes In Students Observed By Staff

Frequency	Observed Change
12	Math
11	Reading skills
11	Language/verbal skills
7	Attitude toward school
6	Self-concept
5	Readiness-skills
3	Group skills/social independence
3	Following directions
3	Writing skills
2	Cultural enrichment (Phy.Ed..art)
1	Attention span

Although several respondents felt that all benefits were educational, other instructional staff noted a variety of non-educational impacts. A summary of these can be seen in table 2.

Table 2

Non-Educational Impact Reported By Staff

Frequency	Impact
7	Social development
7	Positive attitude toward self
5	Health/nutrition
3	Knowledge of community
3	Creativity
2	Cultural enrichment
2	Recreation
2	Attitude toward school
1	Parent involvement
1	Transportation

Teachers were also asked if they would indicate any elements they felt would improve their program. Although most staff members were happy with their programs, several suggestions (see table 3) for program improvement were made.

Table 3

Recommended Changes For Future Programs

Frequency	Recommended Changes
7	More Phy.Ed. (track meets, swimming)
5	More instructional materials & supplies
5	More parent involvement (PAC, volunteers)
3	More pre-planning 1 teacher training
2	A bilingual report card
2	"Wellness training"
2	Spanish language instruction
2	Expanded program (operate longer)
2	More art and music

The evaluation questionaire completed by administrative personnel (this group included recruiters, project directors, site coordinators, and secondary teachers) contained two parts. Administrators were asked to objectively rate six areas on the basis of clarity. In the second part of this evaluation administrators were asked to make comments about these areas. (See appendix E)

Evaluation of Migrant Education Programs
by Administrative Personnel (N=21)

1. Goals of State Migrant Program are:

Unknown to me	Need some clarification	Clear to me
1	9	11

Comment: The most frequent comment of those administrators for whom the goals were not completely clear was, "make the goals more specific and present them earlier in the program".

2. Responsibility of Administrative Personnel is:

Unknown to me	Need some clarification	Clear to me
2	10	9

Comment: Most administrators felt this was sufficiently well defined. Two administrators thought that the role of state level administration needed some clarification.

3. Role of the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) is:

Unknown to me	Need some clarification	Clear to me
0	13	9

Comment: Most administrators felt that the role of the PAC was clear or would become clear as a result of involvement with their PAC.

4. Curriculum objectives are:

Unknown to me	Need some clarification	Clear to me
4	8	9

Comment: Most administrators felt that they understood the curriculum objectives but would like more specificity. A few administrators felt that a "list" of objectives should be included in the state plan.

5. Utilization of the MSRTS Form is:

Unknown to me	Need some clarification	Clear to me
2	14	5

Comment: The most frequent comment made by the administrators was, "we need it sooner if we are going to use it". More inservice in the use of the MSRTS was stated as a need.

6. Function of State Evaluation Conference is:

Unknown to me	Need some clarification	Clear to me
0	5	15

Comment: Several administrators felt that attendance at the evaluation conference should be mandatory for all staff.

Comments and Program Highlights

Title I-Migrant summer education services in the State of Wisconsin came to a successful conclusion on August 17th of 1979. As always, the crises and emergencies that developed at various sites were as predictable as the unpredictable and trying lives of the many migrant families that labor in the fields of Wisconsin. The dedication of the staff in responding to the unexpected changes in our school activities resulting from an increase or decrease in the migrant labor population was most admirable. The DPI is cognizant and appreciative of the hard work and dedication of all program participants.

During the first two months of 1979, the program administrator and a typist were conducting activities in preparation for the arrival of migratory children who would be participating in migrant education programs funded through Title I E.S.E.A. With much work to be done, it was a day to remember each time an individual joined the migrant education staff. Although we were late in getting all facets of the program administration and supervision fully operative, the abilities, dedication and hard work of the staff were able to improve on previous years' performances. Much of these accomplishments can be attributed to the team efforts of Frank N. Brown, Administrator; Daniel Costilla, Supervisor, David De Soto, Coordinator of recruitment; Jeanne Meyer, Teletype operator and MSRTS coordinator; and Kathryn O'Connor, Typist.

This summer, the State of Wisconsin along with many other northern receiving States initiated the National Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) Reading and Math (including mini-skills) Skills. As you all know the MSRTS Skills are designed to transfer academic information in a more complete, accurate and expedient manner. In order for this national network of communications to work positively for the children, all levels of administration and teachers are to support and promote this concept. A weak link along the chain of people involved in MSRTS may cause the entire system to suffer. I was encouraged to see so much interest and enthusiasm among the teaching staff who were making every effort to make the MSRTS work. Many teachers had utilized the skills workbook as a guide in an effort to concentrate on the various academic deficiencies of the children. The system is new and I am sure that many people in the field will be able to educate us in ways of better utilizing or improving the system. Please feel free to communicate your ideas to our office.

Mr. David De Soto has worked very closely with project recruiters and Jeanne Meyer, our teletype operator, in an effort to more efficiently disseminate information to and from the various sites. We are informed that, compared to past years, considerable improvement has resulted from his efforts. Some parts of the State Eligibility form will have to be changed in the future so that we are in compliance with federal documentation requirements. Recruiters' recommendations will be part of the planning of these changes.

Accurate documentation of recruitment efforts is, of course, the basis for program funding, and therefore, extremely important. Consequently, we are considering earlier employment of recruiters at the various sites for the summer 1980 programs. Our MSRTS enrollment count for the summer of 1979 has already exceeded the 1978 summer count of 1,860, even though the August 1-31 enrollment figures from Little Rock have not yet been computed. Mr. De Soto's attention to this area has resulted in more accurate documentation of eligible students in our office as well as an improved flow of MSRTS information.

The SEA will become more active in identifying and recruiting bilingual/ bicultural teachers who can assist us in fulfilling the bilingual needs of children in our program. We encourage your efforts to assist us in this regard.

A language assessment of migrant children participating in our programs was administered this summer. Our office will share its findings with interested people as soon as it becomes available. Follow-up assessments of children's academic needs will be carried out by DPI.

DPI has cited February 1st on our official calendar of events as the application deadline for proposals from the various CESA's implementing summer programs. This should allow sufficient time for recruitment of interested and qualified staff. This does mean, however, that the state plan will be written at a much earlier date than last year. Consequently CESA administrators and site coordinators will be invited to participate in the drafting of the state plan in the fall of 1979.

In accordance with feedback from program coordinators and teachers at the summer 1979 evaluation meeting, the idea of a statewide in-service prior to the beginning of the summer projects was welcomed. At this time DPI is seriously considering the feasibility of implementing this in-service. The SEA is charged with the responsibility of providing all sites MSRTS in-service. As in-service training is very important and very time-consuming, it appears that this in-service can be done more efficiently at one site with all teachers, MSRTS record clerks, health providers, and recruiters present.

In closing, we want to thank all of you for your outstanding performance and effort in implementing summer educational opportunities for migrant children in our State.

APPENDIX A

Conference Participants

Name	Position	District Represented
Frank N. Brown	Title I, Administrator	DPI
Don Dimick	Deputy Admin.,Mgt.,Plng.& Fed. Assist.	DPI
Daniel Costilla	Title I Migrant Supervisor	DPI
David De Soto	Research Analyst	DPI
David Krueger	Title I Evaluator	DPI
Oscar Cruz	Title I Migrant Consultant	DPI
Milford Schwitz	Recruiter	CESA #13 - Montello
George Tanner	Site Coordinator	CESA #13 - Montello
Guido Ordonez	Teachers Aide	CESA #13 - Berlin
Jean Hofmann	Teacher	CESA #13 - Berlin
Dave Ziemann	Site Coordinator	CESA #13 - Berlin
Joe B. Rodriquez	Teacher	CESA #13 - South Beaver Dam
Kathleen Phillips	Administrator (CESA)	CESA #13
Anna Lee Shoemaker	Teacher	CESA #13 - South Beaver Dam
Ken Youra	Site Coordinator	CESA #13 - Cambria/Friesland
Mariza Smith	Teacher	CESA #13 - Tri-County
Ernie Gomez	Recruiter Aide	CESA #13 - Cambria/Friesland
Jerry Rogohn	Site Coordinator	CESA #13 - Tri-County
Joan Brunn	Teacher	CESA #13 - Tri-County
Rosa M. Gamez	Teacher	CESA #13 - South Beaver Dam
Judy Michel	Teacher	CESA #13 - Tri-County
Efrain Auzh	Parent	CESA #13 - Tri-County
Betty Louise Cortez	Site Coordinator	CESA #13 - South Beaver Dam
Kathleen Starks	Site Coordinator	CESA #13 - Marshall
Joan Frion	Parent	CESA #13 - Marshall
Jim Higgins	Site Coordinator	CESA #13 - Waupun
Rhody L. Grasamkee	Teacher	CESA #13 - Beaver Dam
Julie Sehmer	Food Service	CESA #13
Josie Ramon	Teacher	CESA #18 - Kenosha
Maureen Menor	Teacher	CESA #18 - Kenosha
Ruth Duesterhoeft	Site Coordinator	CESA #18 - Rome Center
Denise Zingg	Site Coordinator	CESA #18 - Kenosha
Ethelyn Millard	Teacher	CESA #18 - Rome Center
Mary Moran	Recruiter	CESA #18 - Rome Center
Jacklen Boyle	Clerk	CESA #18 - Kenosha
Bill Boyle	Site Coordinator	CESA #18
Delfina Cruz	Parent	CESA #18 - Rome Center
Dolores Martinez	Teachers Aide	CESA # 3 - Cedar Grove
Jane Herzog	Teacher	CESA # 3 - Cedar Grove
Wes Veldorst	Teacher	CESA # 3 - Cedar Grove
Ruben Grimaldo	Texas Migrant Council & Recruiter	CESA # 3 - Oconto
Joan Helbing	Teacher	CESA # 3 - Oconto
Linda Meyer	Teacher	CESA # 3 - Bear Creek
J. Bruce Bradley	Administrator	CESA # 3
Cyndy Galloway	Recruiter	CESA # 3
Carol Galloway	Day Care	CESA # 3 - Bear Creek-Proj.Bri.
Bill Morgan	Site Coordinator	CESA # 3
Esteban De La Tore	Teacher	CESA # 3
Douglas Blahnik	Site Coordinator	CESA # 3 - Sister Bay
Roberto Gutierrez	Recruiter	CESA # 3 - Sister Bay
Juan Cortez	Texas Migrant Council Administrator	TMC - Wisconsin
Dorothy McLimans	Administrator (CESA)	Madison Metro Schools
Rosa Maria Alfaro		

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS - INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

1. Do you know your program's objectives for migrant children?
   If yes, how have these objectives been used to guide your teaching procedures, methods, techniques. If no, what guides did you use in lieu of program objectives?

2. What materials and games have you found to be particularly successful?

3. What activities were most effective in stimulating children to learn?

4. What classroom objectives were planned but were not accomplished? Why?

5. Did you try out any new methods, procedures or ideas during this summer? What were they and how did they work out?

6. What methods, procedures or ideas would you like to try? Are there any considerations which would facilitate or inhibit your trying them? What are they?

7. In what areas would you desire to have program input?

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS - ADMINISTRATORS, SITE COORDINATORS, & RECRUITERS

1. How do you perceive the role of the state migrant program supervisor?

2. What strengths or weaknesses do you see in the state plan that facilitates or inhibits the writing of your plans for operating a migrant education program?

3. What state services do you envision as necessary to implement the program at the local level?

4. How do you view your own leadership role in the implementation of local programs and what are the elements in your program that reflect this leadership?

APPENDIX D

(To be completed by conference participants at end of session)

TITLE I-MIGRANT STATE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

August 1, 1978

Project Name: _____

This is designed to evaluate your individual project, not all Title I-Migrant projects as a group. Please answer all questions.

1. What educational changes occurred in your students as a result of the program?

2. Are the changes consistent enough to be educationally significant?

3. What is the non-educational impact of your program?

4. What other elements would you prefer to include in your program?

APPENDIX E

(To be completed by Project Directors at end of session)

TITLE I-MIGRANT STATE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

August 1, 1978

This is designed to evaluate the State Title I-Migrant Program as a single unit. Please rate each area for clarity as follows:
(1) Unknown to me (2) Need some clarification (3) Is clear to me

	(circle one)
1. Goals of State Migrant Program comment:	1 2 3
2. Responsibility of Administrative Personnel comment:	1 2 3
3. Role of the Parent Advisory Council comment:	1. 2 3
4. Curriculum Objectives comment:	1 2 3
5. Utilization of the MSRTS Form comment:	1 2 3
6. Function of State Evaluation Conference comment:	1 2 3